

REMARKS

Claims 1-57 are currently pending in the application. Claims 19, 25 and 35 have been amended. New claims 46-57 have been added. Claims 1-18, 29-31 and 37-45 have been canceled. Claims 19, 25 and 35 have been amended for clarity purposes only and not for any reason related to the statutory requirements for patentability. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 29-31 and 35 are objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 29-31 have been canceled and claim 35 has been amended to clarify the claim.

Claims 1-18 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements. The claims have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 1-18, 20, 31, 36, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-18, 31 and 37-39 have been canceled. Claims 20 and 36 have been amended for clarity.

Claims 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 29-31 have been canceled.

Claims 1-18, 29-31 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-18, 29-31 and 37-39 have been canceled.

Claims 32-33 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 5,574,672 to Mitchell et al. ("Mitchell"). Applicant respectfully submits that Mitchell fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 32, namely, a Help Desk. The Help Desk serves an important function in the claimed invention namely, making available highly skilled technical experts. Examiner has attempted to correlate the "assistant/supervisor" in Mitchell with the Help Desk of the claimed invention. This is an

incorrect correlation because the “assistant/supervisor” feature in Mitchell does not contain highly skilled technical experts like the Help Desk of the claimed invention. Similarly the “help module” in Mitchell does not contain highly skilled technical experts like the Help Desk of the claimed invention, and therefore may not be interchanged with the latter. Applicant respectfully submits that Mitchell does not recite the Help Desk element as set forth in the claimed invention. Therefore claim 32 and its dependent claims are distinguishable over Mitchell and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32-33 and 35-37 as anticipated by Mitchell is respectfully requested.

Claims 40-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,668,629 to Leslie. (“Leslie”). Claims 40-45 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of the claims is rendered moot.

Claims 19-23, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,482 to Fedirchuk et al. (“Fedirchuk”) in view of Mitchell. As previously stated, Mitchell fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 32, namely, a Help Desk. The combination of Fedirchuk with Mitchell does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-23, 25 and 28 as unpatentable over Fedirchuk in view of Mitchell is respectfully requested.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell in view of Leslie. As previously stated, Mitchell fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 32, namely, a Help Desk. The combination of Leslie with Mitchell does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 34 as unpatentable over Mitchell in view of Leslie is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Lekha Gopalakrishnan
Lekha Gopalakrishnan

Registration No.: 46,733
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 965-7364
Attorneys For Applicant